BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD

A. This is a competitive best value continuum in which competing offerors' past performance history will be evaluated on a basis equal to or more important than price considerations. By submission of its offer, the offeror accedes to all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or subfactors. All technically acceptable offers shall be treated equally except for their prices and performance records. Failure to meet a requirement may result in an offer being determined technically unacceptable. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale. The evaluation process shall proceed as follows:

B. Price Evaluation. Initially, offers shall be ranked according to price. The price evaluation will be evaluated based on reasonableness and affordability of the proposed total evaluated price.

C. Technical Acceptability. The Government technical evaluation team shall evaluate the five lowest priced technical proposals on a pass/fail basis, assigning ratings of Acceptable, Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable, or Unacceptable. If no apparent awardee is determined after evaluating the first five lowest priced technical proposals, the government will evaluate the next five. Performance Confidence Assessment. Using questionnaires, the contracting officer shall seek relevant performance information on the lowest priced offerors based on (1) the past and present efforts provided by the offeror and (2) data independently obtained from other Government and commercial sources. The Government reserves the right to seek information on higher priced offerors if none of the lower priced offerors receive a Substantial Confidence performance confidence assessment.

D. Relevant performance includes performance of efforts involving that are similar or greater in scope, magnitude and complexity than the effort described in this solicitation. Each relevant contract shall have been performed during the past five (5) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation. A relevancy determination of the offeror's present and past performance, including joint ventures, subcontractors and/or teaming partners, will be made. In determining relevancy for individual contracts, consideration will be given to the effort, or portion of the effort, being proposed by the offeror, teaming partner, or subcontractor whose contract is being reviewed and evaluated. Higher relevancy will be assessed for contracts that are most similar to the effort, or portion of the effort, for which that contractor is being proposed. The Government is not bound by the offeror's opinion of relevancy. The following relevancy definitions apply:

Very Relevant: Past/present performance effort involved essentially the same magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Relevant: Past/present performance effort involved much of the magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Somewhat Relevant: Past/present performance effort involved some of the magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Not Relevant: Past/present performance effort did not involve any of the magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

E. The purpose of the past performance evaluation is to allow the Government to assess the offeror's ability to perform the effort described in this RFP, based on the offeror's demonstrated present and past performance. The assessment process will result in an overall performance confidence assessment of Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Limited Confidence, No Confidence, or Unknown Confidence as defined in Table 1 (see below). Offerors with no relevant past or present performance history or the offeror's performance record is so limited that no confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned shall receive the rating "Unknown Confidence," meaning the rating is treated neither favorably nor unfavorably.

TABLE 1- PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENTS	
Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror's performance record, the Government has an expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.
Unknown Confidence	No performance record is identifiable or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

F. If the lowest priced evaluated technically acceptable offer is judged to have a Substantial Confidence performance confidence assessment, those offers represent the best value for the Government and the evaluation process stops at this point. Award shall be made to that offeror without further consideration of any other offers.

G. If the lowest priced offeror is not judged to have a Substantial Confidence performance confidence assessment, the next lowest priced offeror will be evaluated and the process will continue (in order by price) until an offeror that was forwarded for technical evaluation is judged to have a Substantial Confidence performance assessment or until all offerors are evaluated. The Government may evaluate additional offerors' technical and past performance proposals if no offeror is judged to have Substantial Confidence. The Contracting Officer shall then make an integrated assessment best value award decision.

H. Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information and in the format specified. Offeror's may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal (for example, the relevance of past performance information) or respond to adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system. Communication conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors will not constitute discussions and the contracting officer reserves the right to award a contract without the opportunity for proposal revision.

I. The Government intends to award the contract without discussions with respective offerors. The Government, however, reserves the right to conduct discussions if deemed in its best interest.